

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the present application. The drawings have been objected to. Claims 8 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 1. Claims 8 and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2. Claims 1, 4, 9, and 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent 5,831,849 (Matsui). Claims 2 and 10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsui in view of US Patent 6,930,795 (Motamed). Claims 3 and 11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsui in view of Motamed, and in further view of US Patent 4,860,005 (Deluca). Claims 5 and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsui in view of official notice. Claims 6, 7, 14, 15, 19, and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsui in view of US Patent 5,922,075 (Bowker). Claim 8, and 16-18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsui in view of US Patent Publication 2004/0025071 (Vicard). Claims 1, 3, 9, 11 and 17 have been amended. Claims 2, 8, 10, and 16 have been cancelled. No new matter has been added.

Objections to the Drawings

The Examiner has objected to the drawings because the allegedly fail to show the feature of the “computing device is in an ACPI S0 state when the computing device is in said simulated off condition.” Applicants respectfully disagree, but have removed the feature from the claims to expedite prosecution. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objections to the drawings.

35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 1 Rejections

The Examiner has objected to claims 8 and 16 as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Applicants respectfully disagree, but have cancelled claims 6 and 8 to expedite prosecution.

35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2 Rejections

The Examiner has objected to claims 8, and 16-20 for being indefinite. Applicants respectfully disagree, but have either cancelled or amended the claims to overcome the rejections. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections and allow claims 8, and 16-20.

35 U.S.C. §§ 102/103 Rejections

Independent claims 1 and 17 as amended contains features that are nether taught or suggested by the art of record. For example, Claim 1 recites:

A method of providing a simulated off condition in a computing device, said method comprising:

- receiving a signal to power off the computing device;
- notifying system components of a low power request;
- reducing power consumption of said system components to a low power state such that said computing device appears to be off, wherein said system components remain enabled to run applications when the computing device is in the simulated off condition;

determining if running applications require full processing when the computing device receives said signal to power off; and

providing a notification that applications will be canceled if the computing device is turned off.

None of the art of record teaches or suggests determining if running applications require full processing when a computing device receives said signal to power off, and providing a notification that applications will be canceled if the computing device is turned off. This feature was originally found in now cancelled claim 2. In the rejection to claim 2, the Examiner stated that Motamed taught such a feature. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Motamed teaches a specialized printing method and system (Motamed, col. 2, ll. 12-15). The system is able to manage one or more printers and print jobs, by routing print jobs to an available printer based on the job characteristics, such as number of pages, color, etc (Id., col. 2, ll. 215-25). In addition, the system is able to split a single print job amongst a number of printers (Id.).

First, Motamed entirely fails to teach suggests determining if running applications require full processing when a computing device receives said signal to power off, and providing a notification that applications will be canceled if the computing device is turned off. The Examiner points to column 6, lines 39-42 as teaching this feature. To the contrary, the cited portion generally describes how error messages are sent to a user when there are problems with a print job. There is simply no mention at all of providing a notification that applications will be cancelled if a computing device is turned off. The described error

protocol similarly makes no mention whatsoever of receiving a signal to power off and fails to describe any scenario associated with powering off a computing device.

Second, even if Motamed taught the claimed features, there is simply no motivation provided in any of the references to combine the teachings of Motamed with Matsui. As described above, Motamed is directed to managing printers and print jobs. Matsui is generally directed to managing power use in a computing system. These are completely different endeavors, and the Examiner has provided no evidence that one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to combine the references. The Examiner generally states that “one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to make such a combination as it provides an efficient way to manage data processing in a system architecture.” Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is directed to a method for providing a simulated off condition in a computing device and not managing data processing. Moreover, Applicants disagree that providing a notification that applications will be canceled increases efficiency.

Because the cited references entirely fail to teach or suggest determining if running applications require full processing when a computing device receives a signal to power off, and providing a notification that applications will be canceled if the computing device is turned off, applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection and allow claim 1. Independent claim 17 contains similar, but not identical, features as independent claim 1, and is therefore allowable for at least the reasons given for independent claim 1. Applicants therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections and allow claim 17.

Claims 3-7 and 18-20 are all variously dependent on independent claims 1 and 17, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons given above for claims 1 and 17. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner with draw the rejections and allow claims 3-7 and 18-20.

Independent claim 9 as amended contains features that are nether taught or suggested by the art of record. For example, Claim 9 recites:

A computing device having a simulated off state,
comprising:
a central processing unit;
a graphics processing unit;

a hard disk drive;
random access memory; and
a power supply,

wherein when said computing device is powered down, the computing device is placed into the simulated off state by placing the system components into a low power state such that the computing device appears to be off,

wherein the computing device remains enabled to run applications when in the simulated off state,

wherein the computing device determines if running applications require full processing when the computing device is powered down, and

wherein the computing device provides a notification that applications will be canceled.

None of the art of record teaches or suggests a computing device determining if running applications require full processing when the computing device is powered down, and the computing device providing a notification that applications will be canceled. This feature was originally found in now cancelled claim 10. In the rejection to claim 10, the Examiner stated that Motamed taught such a feature. Applicants respectfully disagree.

First, Motamed entirely fails to teach or suggest a computing device determining if running applications require full processing when the computing device is powered down, and the computing device providing a notification that applications will be canceled. The Examiner points to column 6, lines 39-42 as teaching this feature. To the contrary, the cited portion generally describes how error messages are sent to a user when there are problems with a print job. There is simply no mention at all of a computing device determining if running applications require full processing when the computing device is powered down. The described error protocol similarly makes no mention whatsoever providing a notification that applications will be canceled and fails to describe any scenario associated with powering down a computing device.

Second, even if Motamed taught the claimed features, there is simply no motivation provided in any of the references to combine the teachings of Motamed with Matsui. As described above, Motamed is directed to managing printers and print jobs. Matsui is generally directed to managing power use in a computing system. These are completely

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-2903/306035.01
Application No.: 10/780,039
Office Action Dated: November 27, 2006

**PATENT
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.116**

different endeavors, and the Examiner has provided no evidence that one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to combine the references. The Examiner generally states that “one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to make such a combination as it provides an efficient way to manage data processing in a system architecture.” Applicants respectfully submit that claim 9 is directed to a system for providing a simulated off condition in a computing device and not managing data processing. Moreover, Applicants disagree that providing a notification that applications will be canceled increases efficiency.

Because the art of record fails to teach or suggest a computing device determining if running applications require full processing when the computing device is powered down, and the computing device providing a notification that applications will be canceled, applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection and allow claim 9.

Claims 11-15 are all variously dependent on independent claim 9, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons given above for claim 9. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections and allow claims 11-15.

Date: January 26, 2007

/Michael W. Tieff/
Michael W. Tieff
Registration No. 57,845

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439